



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,460	09/18/2000	Robert Ellis Chapman JR.	YOR920000625US1	4303
7590	03/30/2004		EXAMINER	
Louis J Percello IBM Corporation Intellectual Property Law Dept P O Box 218 Yorktown Heights, NY 10598			SHARMA, SUJATHA R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2684	
			DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/664,460	CHAPMAN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sujatha Sharma	2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11,18-20,22 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-11,18-20,22,23 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3,6,8-10,22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hashimoto [US 5,255,308].

Regarding claims 1,22 and 23, Hashimoto discloses a method of receiving a group call to all the cordless extensions in the group. Hashimoto further discloses:

- a network node device (3 in Fig.1) for connecting one or more telephone wirelines to one or more wireless connections for receiving incoming calls each specifying a telephone number (See Fig.1);
- one or more wireless signal generators (4 in Fig 1) supporting one or more wireless connections to one or more wireless devices (see Fig.1);
- one or more controllable interconnection between the telephone wirelines and wireless signal generator (see Fig.1 and summary of invention);
- a method of associating a called telephone number with at least two wireless devices and means for alerting the at least two wireless devices associated with the called telephone number of the incoming call (see col. 4, lines 30-57);

- means for accepting one of the said wireless devices as the answerer to the first incoming call and means for directing the second incoming call to the same single number to one of the other wireless devices associated with that telephone number while the first call is in progress. See summary of invention and col. 4, lines 30-57.

Regarding claim 2, Hashimoto further discloses the network node device to comprise one or more computational elements that control said controllable interconnection (see col.2, line 55- col. 3, line 59).

Regarding claim 3, Hashimoto further discloses the network control unit to include processors and memory for controllable interconnections between the wireline and wireless devices (see col.4, lines 40-59).

Regarding claim 6, Hashimoto further discloses the network control unit to include wireline telephony signal generators (see fig. 1).

Regarding claim 8, Hashimoto discloses a method where the information stored includes a connection process to control interconnections of the network control unit between wireline and wireless signal generators (See summary of invention and col. 4, lines 30-57, Fig.1).

Regarding claim 9, Hashimoto further discloses a method where the controllable interconnection is non-blocking (See summary of invention and col. 4, lines 30-57, Fig.1).

Regarding claim 10, Hashimoto further discloses a method where the controllable interconnection is any to any (see Fig.1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4,5,7,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto [US 5,255,308] in view of Antonello [US 5,862,469].

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Hashimoto discloses all the limitations as claimed. However he does not disclose the memory in the network control unit to include long-term storage for information

Antonello, in the same field of endeavor, teaches the use of memory in the network control unit to include long-term storage for information (see col. 4, lines 60-67).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Antonello to Hashimoto in order to carry out successful call processing.

Regarding claim 7, Antonello further discloses a method of generating DTMF tones (see fig. 2).

Regarding claim 11, Antonello further discloses a method where the interconnection is a bus (SEE Fig.1).

5. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto [US 5,255,308] in view of Chambers [US 5,867,485].

Regarding claims 18-20, Hashimoto as treated in claim 1 does not disclose the network node device to comprise of a power supply and the power supply comprising of trickle battery charger and further the battery charger connected to solar cells.

Chambers in the same field of endeavor teaches a system with network node devices and network interface units to replace the last mile fiber/coaxial/twisted pair loop to the curb line wireline networks from residences and/or businesses. Chambers further teaches the method of supplying power to the network interface unit to feed the various components of the unit along with a battery backup. Chambers further teaches the use of solar panels that are used to trickle charge the battery when not in use. See Figures 1 and 4 and column 9, lines 40-50.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the above teachings of Chambers to Hashimoto in order to power the components of the network node for optimal operation and further use the battery backup when power is interrupted.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11,18-20,22 and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Boltz [US 5,943,620] Method for associating one directory number with two mobile stations within a mobile telecommunication network

Nguyen [US 5,699,407] Method and system for implementing extension phone within a cellular radio telecommunication network

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sujatha Sharma whose telephone number is 703-305-5298. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7.30am - 4.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 703-308-7745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sujatha Sharma
March 17, 2004


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER